







Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2022 with funding from  
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761115510893>





CA1

CS

-77E56

(1)

EMPLOYMENT OF PHYSICALLY AND MENTALLY HANDICAPPED PEOPLE  
IN THE FEDERAL PUBLIC SERVICE

The Report of the Joint Public Service Commission and  
Department of Manpower and Immigration Study Team

Virginia C. Miller  
Public Service  
Commission

Helen J. Morton  
Department of Manpower  
and Immigration

April 6, 1977





## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Study Team wishes to thank the many individuals who assisted in the collection of information and in the preparation of this report. In particular, it should be noted that France Trottier was responsible for the study during its initial year; Rob Jones prepared the key working document upon which we have relied so heavily; and Joan Schwartz played a major role in writing the final report.





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
I INTRODUCTION	1
II METHODOLOGY	4
A - Pilot Projects	6
B - Personnel Psychology Centre Literature Study	9
C - Input from Handicapped Public Servants	10
D - Input from Handicapped People and Organizations	11
III RESULTS	14
Problems Uncovered	15
1. Definition of Handicapped	15
2. Statistics	18
3. Lack of Placements during the Pilot Projects	24
4. Job Barriers	29
a) Hiring Practices	29
b) Architectural Barriers	33
c) Attitudinal Barriers	38
d) Ancillary Barriers	41
IV RECOMMENDATIONS	44
A - General Approaches	44
B - Operational Recommendations for Physically Handicapped People	52
C - Operational Recommendations for Mentally Handicapped People	62
BIBLIOGRAPHY	65



## ABSTRACT

After two years of preparation and operation, including a 12-month pilot project on placing handicapped workers in federal government jobs, it must be concluded that physically and mentally handicapped workers do not receive reasonable opportunities to obtain jobs in the federal government.

Barriers to employment have been uncovered in four general areas:

1. Hiring Practices: At every step of the hiring process handicapped people are eliminated from consideration for reasons which are not job-related.
2. Architectural Barriers: For those in wheelchairs, many buildings prevent workers from entering even to apply for a job. Even accessible buildings pose serious and unjustifiable problems for those with restricted mobility.
3. Public Attitudes: Myths and ignorance perpetuate discriminatory attitudes at all levels of society.
4. Technical Aids and Services: Job opportunities are reduced and the costs of holding a job are increased by the lack of, or the high cost of technical aids and suitable transportation.





This report describes these problems and proposes solutions. It concludes:

- An abundance of data exists on the problems encountered by physically handicapped workers. Action, not more studies, is needed; accountability, not quotas, will help; a good public education campaign and strong financial support are needed for programs in all four areas mentioned above.
- For those with mental limitations strong, positive programs are needed; a good public education campaign is needed; quotas may be beneficial; more studies on suitable jobs for such individuals are needed.
- The exact size of these two groups of potential workers is not known. These figures do not exist and further studies to uncover them can only be regarded as misdirected effort. Census questions and the Canada Health Survey may produce some data. Only when sufficient jobs are readily accessible to handicapped people will they apply in representative numbers and the total figures will then be known.
- Poor placement statistics show that good will alone is not enough. Responsibility for placement of handicapped workers must be a full time commitment; those assigned must be accountable for results.





The federal government's image is that of a very poor employer of mentally and physically handicapped people. The only available figures indicate that the number of handicapped employees in the Federal Public Service is a small fraction of what is reasonable to expect. Positive steps must be taken by the federal government to set an example for hiring handicapped workers.



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Under Robert Andras, the Department of Manpower and Immigration carried out several studies on employment and unemployment among handicapped workers. In 1974 Mr. Andras approached the Public Service Commission with his concern for the employment of handicapped people. A feeling existed at that time that current staffing policies and procedures hindered handicapped people from finding jobs in the Federal Public Service and that there was a need for government policies specifically designed for the mentally and physically handicapped. It was felt that the federal government should display leadership in the provision of programs and services to facilitate the integration of handicapped workers into the labour market. To demonstrate and review what could be accomplished, he initiated a joint Public Service Commission/Manpower and Immigration study on the employment of handicapped people in the Federal Public Service.

The awareness of the needs of handicapped persons was a logical outgrowth of prevailing thought. The 1960s had witnessed an awakening in social justice that brought new publicity to old problems. It was a period of ferment during which minority groups became vocal in demanding their fair share of the Affluent Society. Some were recognized others were not. Women, blacks and students were among the first to contribute to and benefit from the change in public attitudes. However,





increasing social awareness did not encompass all groups fighting discrimination, nor was progress uniform.

Canada has lagged far behind Sweden, Britain and the United States in its efforts to integrate handicapped people into the labour force. However, the examples set by other countries have suggested that the same potential exists in Canada. As well, handicapped people have become a more visible, more vocal group. Medical, social and scientific advances have increased the life expectancy and functional capabilities of many handicapped people. Increased educational opportunities have brought more and more disabled individuals within reach of employment. Yet, in many instances, it is the man-made environment, both physical and attitudinal, which presents a stumbling block to entry into the labour market. It is unfortunate that these man-made barriers (e.g., inaccessible transportation and communication systems) have made it harder for those with handicaps to share their problems and formulate demands. Thus, unlike other groups, their voice is being heard in the restrictive seventies instead of the affluent sixties. Since all available data indicates that those with handicaps suffer first and most during periods of economic slow down, it is all the more essential that positive measures be undertaken to aid them at this time.

Though the exact magnitude of the situation is not known, estimates of people working in the field and recent studies of





known handicapped people suggest the numbers of handicapped individuals with knowledge, skills, abilities, experience, interests and career aspirations are large and increasing. Improving their employment opportunities is more than a humanitarian measure. Handicapped people are a valuable resource which is not being realized and, from a purely economic standpoint, efforts to integrate them into the work force are profitable in terms of getting them off the social assistance and unemployment insurance rolls and onto the tax lists.



## CHAPTER II

### METHODOLOGY

In 1974, the joint Public Service Commission/Manpower and Immigration study of employment opportunities for handicapped people in the Federal Public Service was launched. Its terms of reference were formulated with a view to securing full employment opportunities in the Federal Public Service for applicants with physical and mental handicaps.

The Department of Manpower and Immigration initiated the formation of a National Committee of the Public Service Commission/Manpower and Immigration joint study of employment opportunities for handicapped people in the Federal Public Service. Membership included representatives from Manpower and Immigration and the Public Service Commission. In addition the Department of Public Works and National Health and Welfare were represented by one member each, the former because of its knowledge of and experience with factors related to actual physical accommodation, the latter because of its major role in the administration of social service programs in Canada. Treasury Board, as the employer of the Public Service, was also represented on the National Committee. A Study Team consisting of one staff member from the Department of Manpower and Immigration and one from the Public Service Commission organized and supervised the work in each Department and co-ordinated the results. Departments represented on the original National Committee and experts within the two





responsible Departments (especially members of the Personnel Psychology Centre of the Public Service Commission) assisted as requested.

The Study Team established its terms of reference around an interim definition of "handicapped", recognizing that further clarification of terminology was necessary. For the purposes of the joint study, a broad definition was used which included those with visual, hearing, paraplegic, orthopaedic, mental and epileptic handicaps, referred by agencies for the handicapped or self-proclaimed as handicapped in any of these ways. Social, emotional and temporary disabilities were excluded from consideration by the joint study.

The overall aims of the joint study included:

- the analysis of Public Service hiring practices to identify and eliminate unnecessary or restrictive standards and procedures through the operation of pilot projects in four cities;
- the investigation of physical structures that form barriers to those with handicaps;
- the proposal and development of new procedures to facilitate the hiring and retention of handicapped individuals.



The ultimate responsibility for co-ordinating regional input, analysing project results and presenting final recommendations rested with the Study Team.

Initiatives were taken in four areas in pursuit of these aims:

A) Pilot Projects

Pilot projects were established in Vancouver, Toronto, Montreal and the National Capital Region involving the regional office of the Public Service Commission, the Canada Manpower Centre and selected local departments. An analysis of available statistics on handicapped workers or potential workers in these four cities was carried out by T.J. Samuel of the Department of Manpower and Immigration.

Three specific project objectives were set in keeping with the overall goals of the National Committee:

- (i) the referral of qualified mentally and physically handicapped applicants to positions in the Federal Public Service in accordance with the merit principle;
- (ii) the exposure of barriers which handicapped people encounter in the course of job seeking, placement, and employment;





- (iii) the formulation of recommendations modifying public service employment practices to ensure full employment opportunity for mentally and physically handicapped applicants in the Federal Public Service.

The pilot projects, carried out over the calendar year 1976, were administered by Regional Committees which consisted of representatives of the Public Service Commission, Manpower and Immigration, participating departments and, where possible, National Health and Welfare and Public Works.

The Public Service Commission was responsible for referrals in all categories except Operational and Administrative Support in Vancouver, Toronto and Montreal, and for all categories except Operational in the National Capital Region. Responsibility for referrals in the Operational and Administrative Support categories in Vancouver, Toronto and Montreal, and for the Operational category only, in the National Capital Region rested with the local Canada Manpower Centre.

For the duration of the pilot projects, officers of the Public Service Commission Regional Office and the Canada Manpower Centre in each location were requested to:

- (i) recruit handicapped applicants or identify, where possible, applications from handicapped candidates;



- (ii) refer, wherever possible, these applicants to vacant Public Service positions compatible with their qualifications and capabilities;
- (iii) obtain the co-operation not only of departments as formal entities, but also of those individuals in departments involved with the hiring or possibly the supervision of handicapped persons;
- (iv) make special arrangements, where necessary, for assessing the qualifications of handicapped candidates;
- (v) consult with local agencies for the handicapped and their employment specialists.

In order to amass placement statistics, Commission officers and Manpower Counsellors assigned to each project were requested to:

- (i) record all applicants identified as handicapped during the pilot study;
- (ii) record and follow-up on the results of all referral actions;
- (iii) determine the success of appointments through appraisals by employers and handicapped persons;



- (iv) identify barriers to employment and special needs of handicapped employees.

No incentives were given to either hiring departments or handicapped persons, in order that placement statistics would reflect the adaptability of the present system of employment practices.

Results and problems were forwarded to the respective Public Service Commission and Manpower and Immigration co-ordinating members of the Study Team.

B) Personnel Psychology Centre Literature Study

At the start of this project the Department of Manpower and Immigration assembled a wealth of written material on the employment of handicapped people. The literature published by Canadian and foreign, government and private sources encompassed enormous volume and scope. The problems uncovered and the suggestions proposed therein warranted review from the perspective of the joint study. The Personnel Psychology Centre of the Public Service Commission was engaged to examine this literature with particular attention to employment barriers identified in past surveys and to the status of legislation and programs in foreign countries. The papers reviewed included Canadian legislation, federal government staffing processes and procedures and a variety of information





published by the Public Service Commission, Manpower and Immigration, Public Works, National Health and Welfare and the National Research Council, as well as by various provincial governments and organizations representing handicapped people. The final report entitled "Some Recommendations with Regards to the Employment of Handicapped Persons in the Federal Public Service", by R. Jones, R. Powell and S. Slack became a key working document in the final analysis by the Study Team.

C) Input from Handicapped Public Servants

The Study Team also agreed that handicapped federal employees, where they could be identified, should be approached on an informal basis as a source of information on the employment situation in the Public Service. It was hoped that handicapped employees could identify barriers they still encounter, although they have managed to surmount the entrance barriers, and describe the solutions - be they ideas or equipment - devised to meet their own requirements which could be used to advantage by handicapped applicants and conscientious employers seeking to overcome barriers in the work environment.

A brief questionnaire was designed by the Study Team with input from experts within the Personnel Psychology Centre to uncover specific problems and practical solutions. It was distributed to National Health and Welfare nurses who were asked to encourage known handicapped public servants to complete it.



Prepared in both official languages, it consisted of a series of simple questions soliciting information relating to type of handicap and type of work, work locations and architectural problems, attitudes, special aids and transportation, other significant needs or difficulties, and measures taken to rectify them. It was emphasized that the respondent could choose to remain anonymous and that all replies would be held in strict confidence. Information gathered in this way would then provide further empirical evidence, though statistically inconclusive, of special problems as they exist in the National Capital Region.

D) Input from Handicapped People and Organizations

The Study Team also wished to draw upon the expertise of handicapped people themselves and those experienced in dealing with them. During the entire course of the study, members of the National and Regional Committees held informal discussions with individuals, associations and self-help groups. Information obtained during other, concurrent, studies on employment of handicapped workers was also utilized. Since the spring of 1976, extensive meetings were held from coast to coast with the visually handicapped and with provincial officials administering various social service programs and with regional Canada Manpower officials and counsellors. Input was also obtained in meetings with:





- Blind Organization of Ontario using  
Self-Help Tactics (BOOST) - Toronto
- Canada Assistance Plan Officers
- Canadian Co-ordinating Council on Deafness
- Canadian Council of the Blind
- Canadian Council of Rehabilitation Workshops
- Canadian Hearing Society
- Canadian National Institute for the Blind
- Handicap Effort to Employ the Disadvantaged  
(HEED) - Vancouver
- Local School Boards
- Manitoba Federation of the Visually Handicapped
- Manitoba League of the Physically Handicapped
- Mental Health Rehabilitation Centre
- Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services



- Ottawa and District Association for the  
Mentally Retarded
- Regroupement des Aveugles et des Amblyopes du  
Québec
- Serving the Aims and Needs of the Disabled  
(STAND) - Ottawa
- Vision Canada - Professor C. Greenland
- Vocational Rehabilitation Disabled Persons  
Officers

Contact was made with many other groups dealing with disabilities and medical problems which may cause employment handicaps. In addition the Study Team met with many individual handicapped people.



## CHAPTER III

### RESULTS

Despite the program outlined in the previous chapter very few (47) placements of handicapped people were made. Nevertheless, the exercise was a valuable one. Examination of the efforts made to place handicapped workers, and the reasons for their failure, exposed problems and artificial barriers. The lack of a completely acceptable definition of handicapped workers, of statistics on either employed, unemployed or employable handicapped people, of significant achievements in placement of handicapped applicants (and the consequent fact that such people are discouraged and rarely apply to the Federal Public Service) are all factors which have, in the past, concealed the gravity of the problem. The most obvious result of this study is that more studies will not help. Employment opportunities and conditions of work, for handicapped people in the Federal Public Service are very poor and only positive, funded, actions can improve them.

The observations discussed in this chapter draw upon all aspects of the joint study. It should be noted however that three reports were particularly significant:

- Handicapped Persons Study by T.J. Samuel,  
Department of Manpower and Immigration,  
February 1975





(An examination of the lack of statistical data in the four pilot project cities).

- Job Barriers: A Reference Paper Delimiting the Problem by the Research Project Group, Department of Manpower and Immigration, October 1975.
- Some Recommendations with Regards to the Employment of Handicapped Persons in the Federal Public Service by R. Jones, R. Powell and S. Slack, Personnel Psychology Centre, Public Service Commission, October 1976.

The last document was prepared after the pilot projects had been in progress for some time. It contains a review of recent reports available in the Department of Manpower and Immigration and National Health and Welfare, of international and recent Canadian legislation, and of Public Service staffing practices. Thus it forms a major background paper to the present report.

### Problems Uncovered

#### 1) Definition of "Handicapped"

A major stumbling block encountered in gathering and analyzing



information on the physically and mentally handicapped is the breadth and lack of uniformity of definitions of "handicapped". This was made apparent by the literature review and through extensive consultations with associations for the handicapped.

For the purposes of the joint study, the Study Team adopted the following definition:

Physical disability, infirmity, malformation or disfigurement that is caused by bodily injury, birth defect or illness and includes epilepsy and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, "physical handicap" includes any degree of paralysis, amputation, lack of physical coordination, blindness or visual impediment, deafness or hearing impediment, and physical reliance on a seeing eye dog or on a wheelchair or other remedial appliance or device which creates problems in finding employment which would not be encountered by a person of equivalent potential competence without the disability.

This definition is the one employed in the proposed Human Rights Bill (C-25) with the exception of the underlined portion which was added by the Study Team to increase its specificity in terms of employment. Broad as this definition is, it does



not incorporate a concern for those whose learning or comprehension capacity is limited. For this group the following definition, a modification of one accepted by both the major Canadian and American associations working with the mentally retarded, is proposed:

A mentally handicapped person is one whose learning or comprehension capacity is significantly less than that normally expected from someone of his or her age and experience, but who is capable of performing some tasks in a reliable manner under a reasonable amount of supervision.

Where a definition is too broad, services will be provided to the mildly handicapped who may, in fact, be tapping resources for which they have no urgent need, leaving insufficient for those with more severe handicaps and more urgent needs. On the other hand, a narrow definition may exclude from services and amenities those persons whose disabilities are not severe enough to meet clinical definitions. By its scope the definition of a particular handicap not only governs the provision of services, but also affects the compilation of statistics.

In order to develop policy and administer it fairly and uniformly, a working definition of handicapped must be





established and adopted. Physical and mental handicaps must be separated in recognition of the need for different approaches for the respective situations. Definitions must be clearly related to the ability to perform within the context of employment. Above all they must be flexible enough to recognize degrees of disability.

While the above definitions are proposed by the Study Team for interim use, it is emphasized that greater precision is desirable.

## 2) Statistics

Reliable statistics are essential to the examination of any issue and the subsequent formation of policy. In revealing the size and nature of the problem under scrutiny, they permit realistic manpower and resource planning, and may, in themselves, suggest solutions.

Studies of the handicapped are severely hampered by the lack of statistics. One of the major problems confronting the Study Team in the course of this project has been the difficulty in obtaining an accurate count of the number of handicapped people in the country, and the number of physically and mentally handicapped employees in the Federal Public Service.

Information is needed to determine the size of the problem.

Useful statistics are not available on the total number of



handicapped people, the number employable, the number employed or the number employed in the Federal Public Service. In some cases, no data is available; in others, figures are unreliable or incomplete. Estimates, aggregate statistics and inconsistent terminology make it difficult to analyze and utilize forthcoming data. Data was sought from a variety of sources without much success.

- a) Government departments and agencies, Statistics Canada, Canada Manpower Centres and many handicapped associations cannot furnish data on the employment or employability of the handicapped. This was confirmed in the case of the four cities selected for the pilot projects, in the report by T.J. Samuel.
- b) Health and Welfare reports that statistics on the numbers of handicapped persons employed in the Public Service have never been assembled and are not available through Public Health units. The health units have statistics only on those employees who make use of the services offered. Many handicapped persons employed in the Public Service have never visited available facilities; many others have no direct access to a health unit. While there is a "chronic disease" register, it does not include conditions within the definition of handicapped.



- c) In order to avoid allegations of discrimination, information on handicapped applicants is not registered in such a way as to be readily computer-retrievable from the application forms of the Public Service Commission or Canada Manpower Centres.
- d) Data provided by Revenue Canada Taxation concerning a special personal deduction claimed by those with certain handicaps does not indicate the nature of the handicap or the age or employability of the claimant, nor does it include all types of physical handicaps or those who do not file income tax returns.
- e) A survey of the known handicapped persons employed in the Public Service in Ottawa conducted by Health and Welfare Canada at the request of the Study Team failed to generate significant information. Individuals refused to respond to a questionnaire because of a concern for social and employment repercussions.
- f) The difficulty in gathering statistics on handicapped people is often aggravated by the rigidity of definitions imposed by associations for the handicapped and the hesitation of individuals to declare themselves handicapped. For example, figures compiled by the Canadian National Institute for the Blind do not include a great many persons with





vision problems severe enough to cause employment difficulties, but not sufficiently acute to qualify for registration with the Institute.

Statistics are needed to substantiate the criticism that the Public Service is a poor employer of handicapped persons.

Various sources of data permit the following calculations to be made:

- A study based on the 1970 census in the United States showed that one in eleven or 9% of Americans in the working age group (15-64) is handicapped. This figure excludes all those not considered potential job-seekers such as those in institutions or in the armed forces.
- For the present study an allowance must be made for people who, although not in institutions, are too severely handicapped to work in the competitive labour market (e.g., the Public Service) although some of those excluded in this way may be able to work in sheltered workshops. Again there is a lack of exact figures, but most analyses and estimates suggest that housewives, students and those too severely handicapped to work account for no more than one-third to one-half of this 9% group. Thus the number of employable handicapped



people in the United States, who either have or want employment, is estimated to represent at least 4.5% of the working age group.

- On the basis of demographic and economic similarities, it is reasonable to adopt 4.5% as a rough, albeit conservative, estimate of the employable handicapped in Canada. Using the figures on the Canadian labour force published by Statistics Canada in December 1976 the number of employable handicapped Canadians can be estimated to be approximately 460,000 people.

Similarly if, as is frequently emphasized, the Federal Public Service is to be a good employer, offering opportunities to all Canadians without discrimination, it too should reflect the proportion of handicapped workers in the country. This means that approximately 4.5% of all federal public servants would be individuals suffering from handicaps. Figures on those with handicaps who are employed in the Public Service across Canada are not available. However, some figures are available in the National Capital Region.

- A survey of known handicapped employees in the National Capital Region compiled by Health and Welfare nurses in 1974 reported that fewer than 500 of 60,000, or less than 0.8% of federal employees in the National Capital Region were



handicapped. Nor is there any indication that the situation has improved in the interim.

- Although figures are needed on a national basis, the example of the National Capital Region must be used as the basis for comparison because it is the only area for which any data is available. Nevertheless, extrapolations from American figures may be tenuous if Ottawa is not a typical urban population and if the federal government is not a typical large employer.

There is more than one study suggesting the true numbers of handicapped people in the United States and Canada. For example one originating in Kingston, Ontario suggests that 1 in 7 or 14% of the population is handicapped. These differences may reflect only differences in the definition of "handicapped". It should also be emphasized that the estimates of the population currently under-represented in the Federal Public Service are conservative. Thus although the exact size of the problem is unknown, all input indicates that the Federal Public Service in the National Capital Region has a poor record of hiring handicapped workers. The overall picture for Canada can only be more discouraging given that employment of handicapped people is usually worse outside major urban areas.



### 3) Lack of Placements during the Pilot Projects

As indicated earlier, the placement of handicapped workers in Federal Public Service positions was one of the goals of the pilot projects. Unfortunately few placements were made despite genuine efforts on the part of individuals in both the Department of Manpower and Immigration and the Public Service Commission. It should be reiterated: no incentives were offered to employers; no special assistance was offered to handicapped clients; no special publicity was undertaken. The results of the pilot projects emphasize the need for all these activities.

Table 1 summarizes the placement related activities of the pilot projects.





TABLE 1

RECORD OF HANDICAPPED CLIENTS AND ACTIONS DURING THE PILOT PROJECTS,  
DECEMBER 1975 - DECEMBER 1976

Type of Handicap	Action Centre	Number of Individuals	Number of Referrals	Number Hired
Hearing and Speech Problems	P.S.C. M & I	24 4	36 11	20 4
Vision Problems & Totally Blind	P.S.C. M & I	5 4	7 5	1 3
Severe Mobility Problems	P.S.C. M & I	4 0	19 0	4 0
Paraplegia (Wheelchairs)	P.S.C. M & I	3 4	6 3	2 0
Mental Retardation and Slow Learning	P.S.C. M & I	14 8	35 10	5 2
Epilepsy	P.S.C. M & I	1 1	1 3	0 0
Cerebral Palsy	P.S.C. M & I	2 0	4 0	1 0
Orthopaedic Problems	P.S.C. M & I	1 5	1 9	0 2
Unspecified Physical Handicap	P.S.C. M & I	0 1	0 2	0 1
Combined Vision & Hearing Problem	P.S.C. M & I	0 1	0 2	0 1
Combined Vision & Paralytic Problem	P.S.C. M & I	0 1	0 2	0 1
Sub-Total	P.S.C.	54	109	33
Sub-Total	M & I	29	47	14
TOTAL		83	156	47



From Table 1 several points can be determined. It takes many referrals to place a handicapped person in a job. Since some severely handicapped people (e.g., the paraplegic with vision problems) were placed, it is obvious that referrals must have been to suitable positions. For example, clients in wheelchairs must be referred to positions in buildings accessible to wheelchairs. The fact that Manpower and Immigration made only three referrals of applicants in wheelchairs indicates that many buildings are inaccessible.

Other facts revealed by the pilot projects:

- 1) The majority of Public Service Commission referrals occurred in the National Capital Region where one person was assigned full-time responsibility for this project.
- 2) The Canada Manpower Centres in Toronto and the National Capital Region achieved equal results. The greater number of federal government positions in Ottawa-Hull was offset by the assignment of one full-time project officer in Toronto.
- 3) Consultation with groups of handicapped people indicates that many regard it as a waste of time to apply for federal government positions. Past experiences have discouraged them. Thus the number



of applicants shown in Table 1 does not reflect the total number of unemployed handicapped people in the four cities.

The most conservative estimates of the potential handicapped worker population in the four pilot project cities is:

Vancouver	14,000
Toronto	35,000
Ottawa-Hull	8,000
Montreal	33,000

- 4) Vacancies in Federal Public Service positions reported to the main Canada Manpower Centre in Vancouver showed that the economic climate further reduced the poor opportunities for handicapped workers:

December 1975 (start of the pilot project)	100 vacancies
January 1976	80 vacancies
February 1976	61 vacancies
March 1976	39 vacancies

- 5) Virtually all hirings reported in Table 1 were in very low-paying positions. Many of these positions were also short term less than six months. Thus





even the results obtained have done little to improve the long-term unemployment and under-employment of handicapped people.

- 6) Comments from officers involved in the pilot projects provided much valuable information. These comments typify the attitudinal barriers which exist in the departments. A staffing officer with the Public Service Commission in Toronto reported:

"The recruiting theme in the departments appears to be that they are just not willing to consider handicapped people for professional or semi-professional positions".

Similarly a Project Officer in the Department of Manpower and Immigration in Toronto noted that an attempt to market a deaf client had been unsuccessful; "When department was contacted, telephone duties were added to job specifications".

It must, therefore, be concluded that without the pressure of an established Treasury Board policy, the full-time commitment of Public Service Commission and Department of Manpower and Immigration officers, and departmental accountability no significant increase in the employment of handicapped workers will result.



#### 4) Job Barriers

A prime objective of this project has been the identification of job barriers. These are factors which tend to exclude capable people from employment in specific jobs, but which are not directly related to actual job requirements. They can be grouped under four general headings: hiring practices, architectural, attitudinal, and ancillary. Under the present system of employment, they impose constraints during the job search, through assessment devices and in the work environment.

##### a) Hiring Practices

Staffing in the Public Service is a complex process. When a request to fill a position is submitted, basic data concerning the position is assembled and a "Statement of Qualifications" is prepared. The responsible staffing officer consults the staffing priorities notices to ascertain whether any persons are entitled to prior appointment or consideration for appointment. Where no appointment is made from the staffing priorities notices, the area of competition, selection process and methods of assessment are determined. A number of activities are undertaken to identify eligible and basically qualified applicants. Candidates are then assessed by a selection board to determine their relative merit, and those qualified are ranked in order of merit. An appointment is made according to requirements which include the establishment of an eligible list, notification of selection results, and the



granting of appeal rights, where applicable.

In the event that attempts to recruit suitable candidates from within the Public Service are unsuccessful, recruitment from outside the Public Service is considered. Eligible candidates are referred by the Public Service Commission or a Canada Manpower Centre where departments are not authorized to recruit from outside. The Public Service Commission maintains applicant inventories by advertising in newspapers and other publications to advise the public of job opportunities with the Public Service.

Within this sequence, there exists an extensive array of actions, some prescribed by legislation or by Public Service Commission or Treasury Board directives and others that have been accepted as common practice, intended to ensure that, consistent with the principle and provisions of the Public Service Employment Act, the best qualified candidate is selected for appointment.

For the applicant, the sequence of events is a formidable one; for the handicapped candidate, the search for employment may be further impeded by barriers imposed by a number of hiring practices.

Advertising for vacancies may not be readily accessible to the handicapped candidate. Notices published in newspapers are not



accessible to the blind person; notices posted in public places are largely inaccessible to those with restricted mobility.

In the initial stages of the search for employment, enquiries and applications may pose undue difficulties for handicapped people. Public Service Commission offices and Canada Manpower Centres may be physically inaccessible to the person confined to a wheelchair. Deaf people may be inconvenienced by their inability to obtain advice quickly and efficiently over the telephone; blind people may require not only advice, but physical assistance in completing standard application forms.

The delay involved in hearing about a vacancy, arranging assistance to enquire further and arranging assistance to make an application may be considerable and the closing date may arrive before an application can be completed.

Classification and Selection Standards set minimum requirements in an attempt to ensure the appointment of competent persons; this is a sound hiring practice where there is no discrepancy between stated and actual requirements. Minimum requirements should relate to knowledge, skills and abilities actually required. However, the so-called "essential" qualifications may in fact be more than is needed for successful job performance.





Job descriptions may not reflect in a realistic manner the duties to be performed. A geologist confined to a wheelchair might be eliminated from a competition for a specific desk-bound job because general selection criteria assume that field work is required, or because management is looking for versatility and promotability beyond the actual requirements of the position under consideration.

In some instances, educational requirements are over-stated; in others, the educational attainment of a handicapped applicant may not reflect actual intellectual capabilities because disabilities limit access to educational facilities or prevent traditional methods of assessment.

Standard testing instruments have been developed to determine whether a person meets established selection criteria.

Alternative methods of assessment to the written test must be found for blind applicants, alternatives to the oral test are required for deaf people. The time allotted to each candidate for tests and as well for interviews may be inadequate to permit a fair evaluation by a person handicapped by hearing or speech impediments or by lack of physical co-ordination. In all cases, tests must be valid assessment devices which, in fact, provide a true measure of a person's capabilities with respect to the duties of the position to be filled.



Interviews, trying experiences at the best of times, can be particularly difficult for persons whose abilities to communicate are in some way impaired and may fail to uncover the potential of the applicant. As well, board members may misinterpret the capabilities of a handicapped candidate because of a lack of understanding of the nature of the particular disability.

It is obvious that hiring practices can and do form artificial barriers for handicapped applicants. As suggested in the analysis prepared by the Personnel Psychology Centre of the Public Service Commission, a thorough review of all job classification and qualifications is desirable. However, handicapped job applicants cannot remain excluded until the completion of such a major undertaking. Moreover, the real problem is not just job classifications and qualifications but the unresponsiveness of the large bureaucratic system to the exceptional case. What is needed is individual attention for individual applicants.

#### b) Architectural Barriers

Architectural barriers are features of the man-made physical environment which restrict mobility, deny full use of facilities or present unnecessary hazards. Building and transportation facilities are developed with little consideration for the needs of handicapped people. Consequently, features of the normal work environment make it difficult, even impossible for



physically disabled workers to function. However, it is the man-made structure, not the person's impairment, which limits an individual's mobility.

Present architectural designs that do accommodate handicapped persons are not mandatory across Canada and thus are not present in all buildings rented or owned by the federal government. Furthermore, Supplement 5 of the National Building Code, which purports to deal with such problems, is incomplete and inadequate. Although Supplement 5 is currently under review only a full participation of people with all types of handicaps in this review, and mandatory compliance of all federal departments with this revised code, will correct the situation.

Studies of architectural barriers by physiotherapists and by associations serving handicapped people have revealed a number of common problems. Further to these, a survey by the Department of Public Works, of all Canada Manpower Centres across Canada indicated that half were inaccessible and of those one-third required relocation.

The restricted survey of handicapped federal employees in the National Capital Region conducted by the Study Team and administered by Health and Welfare nurses exposed a number of difficulties encountered even in so-called accessible buildings where handicapped people are working. Unnecessary extra



difficulties were encountered in access to buildings, in interior mobility, in the work space and in cafeteria facilities.

For example,

- 1) Inadequate snow removal, inconvenient parking, and wheelchair ramps too steep for self-propulsion present problems in reaching the place of employment.
- 2) Outer doors, as well as doors to stairwells and washrooms, are unduly heavy and may be inoperable by those wearing braces or whose balance is unsure.
- 3) Floors and stairs are slippery, and especially treacherous when wet.
- 4) Stairwells do not have good handrails on both sides or hand-rails themselves are too wide to grip firmly. Windows are needed in doors to stairwells to allow those of slow mobility to see and be seen.
- 5) Elevators have doors that close too fast or buttons that are too high. Heat sensor elevator





buttons are useless to those who must employ mechanical aids.

- 6) Drinking fountains and library stacks are too high.
- 7) Cafeteria facilities are inaccessible or inconvenient. Counters are too high or aisles are too narrow to accommodate a person confined to a wheelchair. Turnstile entrances hinder access and trolleys are not available for persons on crutches who are unable to carry lunch trays.
- 8) There is particular concern that emergency systems overlook handicapped persons. Public announcements do not warn deaf people. Wheelchairs are not available for those not normally so confined, but who have some ambulatory disability and may need them in an emergency.

It is interesting that employees criticized buildings such as Statistics Canada, which offers facilities to accommodate handicapped people. However, it must be remembered that public servants offered comments on their own work environment and that the buildings where handicapped people were employed were the ones criticized. Federal buildings that pose the greatest



problems were those least open to complaint in this survey because few, if any, were accessible to handicapped workers. In one sense a complaint can be regarded as a positive result - at least the handicapped worker is there.

Discussions with handicapped people have indicated that they are forced to contend with trying conditions which would provoke non-handicapped employees to lodge a grievance. One poignant example involved an employee confined to a wheelchair and forced to use a collection bag for urine because washrooms were located in the stairwells between floors.

When one examines the inconvenience, excessive expenses, personal indignities and downright hardship which many handicapped people endure to obtain and retain a job, it must be acknowledged that they really want to work and dispel the myth that they are "unable to compete".

Statistics available at present and predictions for the future indicate that the elimination of architectural barriers is urgently needed because of the steady increase in the ability of handicapped people to enter the work force. The creation of strong incentives for the builders, including tax exemptions, government rental preferences and other measures are needed to encourage the provision of facilities for handicapped workers not now required by law. It should be noted, moreover, that enabling statutes exist for all such structural changes. What



is missing is action by the Treasury Board to give such expenditures a high priority in each federal department's estimates.

### c) Attitudinal Barriers

The problems which hinder handicapped people in obtaining and retaining employment suited to their skills and abilities are not usually the result of overt action against these individuals. Nevertheless, the Health and Welfare nurses' survey, the Personnel Psychology Centre literature review and discussions with handicapped people have pointed to attitudinal discrimination among management, co-workers and public as one of the major problems. Socially accepted prejudices based largely on ignorance and myth lie at the root of the problem. Misconceptions are often unquestioned even by people with strong social consciences.

Management decisions regarding the employment of handicapped persons reflect concerns for: greater production costs; increased rates of accidents, absenteeism and turnover; lower productivity; poorer quality of work; extra training; additional supervision; higher insurance rates; and special work facilities. Management also fears employee resistance to workers with handicaps.

Staffing officers may approach the handicapped applicant with a certain reserve, even fear or pity. They may assume that the



supervisor would not consider a handicapped worker or that a handicapped person could not perform the duties of the job.

Without a proper understanding of the handicap and an awareness of alternative methods of evaluation, board members may be under the impression that a handicapped candidate is not qualified for the job under consideration. For example, a slowness of speech due to congenital deafness may be misconstrued as an indication of reduced intellectual capabilities.

Employees' attitudes may create an uncomfortable work environment which undermines the self-confidence and competence of the handicapped worker. Because of the fear or ignorance of co-workers, the handicapped employee may be socially outcast. The nurses' survey showed that such attitudinal problems lie as much with supervisors and administrators as with co-workers.

Attitudinal barriers tend to place too much emphasis on the disabilities and not enough on the abilities of handicapped people. The public may contend that the "able-bodied" be given priority for employment over those with handicaps. Non-handicapped people also presume that they are independently capable of making decisions affecting the welfare of handicapped people.





Attitudinal barriers are all too often based upon assumptions which are unfounded in fact. Blind people can and do work near machinery. Speech and hearing difficulties do not portend mental limitations, nor does blindness presage deafness - three common misconceptions.

A report prepared in 1975 by the Health and Welfare Committee of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce indicated that the level of production, attendance records, turnover rates and quality of work of physically handicapped workers was rated as the same or better by 85% or more of respondent employers. Mentally handicapped workers were also highly rated in their attendance, length of employment and quality of work, though understandably their level of production was not as high. The report goes on to state that safety considerations were the third most commonly stated reason for not hiring those with handicaps, but that Workmen's Compensation Boards, the Department of Veterans Affairs and the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare all report that handicapped workers' safety records are significantly better than average.

There is evidence to suggest that there is increasing public awareness of and concern for the employment plight of handicapped people. Recent publicity efforts in the United States and Britain have significantly furthered the cause of public enlightenment. A comprehensive campaign of public information and education is needed in Canada. There is ample



material which already exists that can be used for such a campaign.

d) Ancillary Barriers

A variety of problems related to working conditions, services and transportation for physically handicapped people have been encountered. Reports on such employment barriers have been obtained from associations serving handicapped persons, from provincial social service officers and from handicapped workers themselves.

Transportation can pose a major obstacle to employment for persons with limited mobility. The lack of public and/or special transportation in many communities prevents such persons from applying for and commuting to work. A blind person cannot drive to work, yet with a seeing eye dog may be refused access to local public transit and taxis. The person confined to a wheelchair may require a modified automobile. Those who use specially-arranged transportation or taxis may incur an added financial burden. Many transportation services are operated by charitable organizations which may discontinue service when funds are depleted or which may operate on an inconvenient schedule.

Detailed descriptions of transportation problems are not included in this paper because they are available in studies conducted by Transport Canada. (See bibliography)



Major technical aids are sometimes essential to permit a handicapped worker to perform a job to the best of his or her ability. An Opticon produces raised letters from regular print allowing a blind person to read directly without either a sighted assistant or the production of a Braille copy. This costs \$4,000.00 - \$5,000.00. A Visualtek is a closed circuit T.V. system which acts as a super-magnifier and allows low-vision people to read. It costs approximately \$2,000.00. A visual print-out attachment allows a deaf person to use the telephone. Various models cost from \$700.00 to \$1,500.00. In the present electronic age, such devices are numerous and ever-increasing. The National Research Council has one group working full-time on electronic aids for the blind.

Such devices and aids open new opportunities for employment to many handicapped people. However, a handicapped person often cannot afford the necessary equipment until he or she has been employed for some time. Conversely he or she cannot work effectively without them and the employer is reluctant to absorb the cost. Some aids are furnished to some people under various provincial programs, but those who do not qualify, or those for whom the province has insufficient funds, face a perpetuation of the vicious circle: no work without equipment, no money for equipment without a job.

Yet, not all handicapped persons are confined to wheelchairs or need expensive aids to perform their duties satisfactorily.



Cassettes, heavy paper for work in Braille, desk lamps and modified furniture are among some less costly items which can increase the efficiency of, or reduce the strain on handicapped employees. Furthermore the equivalent supplies (paper and pencils and suitable lighting and furniture) are provided without question or cost to all other employees. The purchase of these special items is authorized under various current Public Service Acts and standing operating procedures; managers need to be encouraged to exercise their existing authority in this way.

In summary, funds, directives and educational publicity will all be needed to provide transportation and aids to permit handicapped employees to enjoy the same working conditions as other employees.





## CHAPTER IV

### RECOMMENDATIONS

#### A) General Approaches

Some but by no means all the employment barriers encountered by handicapped people have been discussed in Chapter III.

Handicapped people may be prevented by their particular handicaps from doing some jobs but the barriers which prevent them from any employment are the products of our society, not of their physical or mental problem. These barriers are real and they will require initiative and funds to remove them.

They cannot be relieved by further studies for the wealth of available information is more than adequate to launch programs to correct the situation. Information, particularly statistics, which is not available will not be produced by further enquiries. Figures now simply do not exist. They will only become available as the result of concerted efforts. The Canada Health Survey may produce some data. A census questionnaire would probably produce more. The true figures will become apparent when employment-related services are adequate and handicapped people identify themselves in the process of seeking and obtaining jobs.

In this context it is essential that the proposed Human Rights Act (Bill C-25, 1977) be passed because Clause 15 of this bill states:



"15.(1) It is not a discriminatory practice for a person to adopt or carry out a special program, plan or arrangement designed to prevent disadvantages that are likely to be suffered by, or to eliminate or reduce disadvantages that are suffered by, any group of individuals when those disadvantages would be or are based on or related to the race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, sex, marital status or physical handicap of members of that group, by improving opportunities respecting services, facilities, accommodation or employment in relation to that group."

This legislation is essential to the identification of those with handicaps who have applied to the Federal Public Service for jobs. It will also permit follow-up enquiries to determine the outcome of their applications and the steps needed to ensure that they have a fair opportunity to obtain employment in positions for which they qualify.

It is abundantly clear that the employment situation for handicapped workers in the Federal Public Service is very poor. Under present economic restraint, it is likely to become worse, and large expenditures will be hard to justify. However the general public is gradually becoming aware of the plight of



handicapped people. The injury toll from automobile accidents is one factor which contributes to this awareness. Modern concerns for life-style for all people might place greater emphasis on the physically and mentally handicapped if the public were given a realistic picture of such individuals.

In times of full employment, handicapped people are drawn into the labour market more easily but under present economic conditions, the effectiveness of efforts to increase the employment opportunities for those with handicaps will depend strongly upon government policy. Before any policy can be established, however, it is necessary to create a framework within which decisions may be made and operational recommendations implemented. This framework must be shaped by guiding principles which will give purpose and direction to concerted efforts to remove artificial barriers to employment and advancement in the Federal Public Service. In the following sections some of our basic policies are outlined.

An obvious way to attempt to ensure placement of handicapped workers is the imposition of a quota system wherein a specified percentage of employees must be handicapped people. By this measure, the federal government could serve as a positive example to demonstrate support for full employment opportunities for handicapped people. However, the federal government can demonstrate its concern in other ways and, for several reasons, quotas are not recommended:



- (i) In countries such as Britain and Sweden quotas have been tried; in some places quotas are no longer enforced because they were not successful; in other places they are filled by placing handicapped workers almost exclusively in the lowest-paid, and often temporary, jobs.
- (ii) Successful employment of handicapped persons in Britain was attributed to its quota system, yet when the economy fell and unemployment rose, it became apparent that success in placing the handicapped worker reflected not the effectiveness of the quota system, but the prevailing climate of full employment.
- (iii) Where the definition of handicap is too wide, employers are able to fill much of their quotas with existing employees who are only mildly disabled. On the other hand, a too narrow definition of "handicap" means that the majority of handicapped people will be excluded from the quota system.
- (iv) In the United States where an affirmative action approach has been taken the legal basis for the enforcement of a quota system is unclear and the consequences for non-adherence are not sufficient to ensure the co-operation of management.





- (v) The imposition of a quota system at this time would be particularly inauspicious in light of the federal government's recently announced limitations on the growth of the Public Service.

An analysis of written documents led the Personnel Psychology Centre to recommend quotas but the Study Team does not advocate them. This stance has been taken as a result of input from handicapped workers who have investigated the utility of quotas and have found them beneficial only on paper.

An accountability system wherein management is responsible and held accountable for employing handicapped persons, is deemed preferable to a quota system. This is a system based on a commitment to social programs; nevertheless, checks in the form of three distinct centres of accountability need to be introduced.

It is recommended that:

- 1) an administrative system be created within Treasury Board to ensure effective program implementation on a national, high-level basis. This bureau will be given general and all-encompassing responsibility for physically and mentally handicapped employees in the Federal Public Service and will exercise those powers and functions relating to personnel management



delegated to Treasury Board by the Financial Administration Act. This bureau will establish the criteria for programs to facilitate the hiring, promotion and retention of handicapped workers and monitor the departments' success(es) in meeting the criteria. It will also direct specialized offices in the Public Service Commission, Manpower and Immigration, Health and Welfare, Public Works and other departments whose respective responsibilities for workers include staffing, training, transportation, finances and building facilities.

- 2) a specialized Office of Opportunities for the Mentally and Physically Handicapped (OOMPH) be created in the Public Service Commission to fulfil a co-ordinating function directly related to hiring practices, employment opportunities and other issues related to staffing. Patterned along the organization of the Office of Equal Opportunities for Women, the central administration in the Public Service Commission will have overall responsibility for policies on the employment of handicapped persons, the implementation of short-term pilot projects and the development of training programs. It will also undertake the review of skill tests and the compilation of statistics.



3) federal government departments be held accountable (in accordance with Treasury Board established criteria) for:

- (i) giving special attention to handicapped applicants in the staffing process;
- (ii) removing architectural barriers;
- (iii) creating an environment which is more sensitive to the needs and abilities of handicapped workers;
- (iv) providing ancillary services to support and ease the working situation of handicapped people.

It is recognized that handicapped people themselves have practical expertise and experience which must not go untapped. To ensure that proposed programs are both useful and functional this expertise needs to be utilized.

It is recommended that:

- 4) a small national Advisory Board composed of handicapped persons be created. Funded by and responsible to Treasury Board, this Advisory Board



composed of people with personal experience of a variety of physical handicaps and personal or professional experience with mental limitations will provide advice on the completeness and practicality of proposed programs.

It will also provide similar advice on proposed legislation and on publicity. Appointed on a fee-for-service basis, the Board should convene quarterly and upon request as specific problems arise. The first task of the Advisory Board will be the establishment of a satisfactory definition of physical and mental handicaps related to employment. The Advisory Board should be supported by two permanent staff members (one junior officer and one clerk) to look after travel arrangements for Board meetings, circulation of material for pre-meeting study, minutes of meetings and correspondence.

Employment opportunities for the mentally handicapped deserve separate consideration because of the particular nature of their problems and capabilities. Limited intellectual capacities will restrict the range of job possibilities and further studies need to be undertaken to establish the employment potential of the mentally handicapped and to identify Public Service jobs compatible with their capabilities.





It is recommended that:

- 5) The problems of mentally handicapped people be addressed separately.

B) Operational Recommendations for Physically Handicapped People

- 1) To amass statistical data on the number of handicapped persons in the population; the number of employable handicapped persons in the population; the number of handicapped persons in the Public Service; the number of handicapped persons applying for the Public Service, essential to the development and evaluation of programs and services for physically handicapped persons, it is recommended that:

- i) The Treasury Board work with Statistics Canada and National Health and Welfare to gather statistics on the number of handicapped persons and the number of employable handicapped persons on a national basis, using the 1981 Census and the Canada Health Survey.
- ii) Departments, with the assistance of National Health and Welfare nurses, be made responsible for identifying the number of handicapped workers now in the Public Service.



iii) The Office of Opportunities for the Mentally and Physically Handicapped in the Public Service Commission be made responsible for gathering statistics on the number of handicapped people applying to the Public Service, from all Public Service Commission staffing programs and regions and Canada Manpower Centres.

2) To remove barriers associated with hiring practices, it is recommended that:

- i) the Treasury Board direct each department to take positive steps to increase the hiring and promotion of handicapped persons at all levels in the organization and especially at the middle and senior management levels;
- ii) the Treasury Board require all departments to ensure that their personnel officers are trained to assist capable handicapped people to present their true qualifications effectively;
- iii) the two organizations with authority for recruitment and referral: i.e., the staffing programs and regional offices of the Public Service Commission and the Canada Manpower Centres in cities with significant numbers of federal



government jobs, make one senior officer accountable for recruitment, referral, and follow-up of handicapped people;

iv) the Public Service Commission and the Department of Manpower and Immigration advertise vacancies in new ways that are accessible to deaf people, blind people, and those with limited mobility;

v) Public Service Commission Officers and Canada Manpower Centre Managers and Counsellors provide assistance and develop flexible ways to permit handicapped persons to apply for employment in the Public Service;

vi) the Office of Opportunities for the Mentally and Physically Handicapped (OOMPH) in the Public Service Commission be responsible for organizing and reporting on pilot projects on the following innovations:

- handicapped people working at home full-time on research and writing jobs when the regular office building is inaccessible to them;

- handicapped people working on a fee-for-



service basis. This could be used for those with considerable experience who are adapting themselves to a handicap or injury or those who can work only between periods of medical care;

- Job-sharing

Many combinations are possible. For example a worker with limited mobility and another with limited vision could undertake the full work-load of two jobs. They could work as a team dividing activities according to the formal job descriptions of the two positions. Another combination is that of two handicapped people who cannot work full-time but share one position on a part-time basis. Similarly a handicapped person seeking part-time work might share a position with a non-handicapped person seeking part-time work;

- A pool of temporary positions identified and reserved by exclusion order, to permit handicapped people to gain employment experience before entering the labour force on a permanent basis. This would compensate for the lack of part-time and summer work





experiences which the non-handicapped usually bring to their first full-time job;

vii) the Office of Opportunities for the Mentally and Physically Handicapped (OOMPH) of the Public Service Commission develop, and provide to all departments, a training package on

- reviewing statements of qualifications and selection profiles to remove discriminatory elements;

- developing and adapting assessment techniques which do not discriminate against handicapped people;

- the implications of various handicaps so that board members will know how to assess handicapped people's real abilities and not be influenced by the handicap;

viii) the Office of Opportunities for the Mentally and Physically Handicapped (OOMPH) in the Public Service Commission contract with the Personnel Psychology Centre to review all aptitude and skill tests to ensure that they are valid assessment devices and to adapt them for use by those with



various handicaps;

ix) each department ensure that a trained (See 2 viii)) personnel officer undertake, on a job-by-job basis as the handicapped apply, a thorough job analysis to ensure that the job description, selection criteria and stated qualifications are fair and realistic, and will not eliminate or cause a handicapped applicant to be disqualified for non-essential reasons;

x) each department ensure that a personnel officer brief selection board members on the nature and implication of a candidate's handicap in order to prepare them psychologically and intellectually for an evaluation based on skills and performance rather than disability.

3) To remove existing architectural barriers and to prevent new ones,

it is recommended that:

i) the Treasury Board direct the National Research Council, Division of Building Research, to revise Supplement 5 of the National Building Code in consultation with handicapped individuals and their representatives;



- ii) the Treasury Board instruct the Department of Public Works to assign an officer full-time responsibility for overseeing architectural changes and investigations on behalf of handicapped workers in the Public Service;
- iii) the Treasury Board amend the present point system for building rental to ensure that a preference is given to buildings which conform with the revised Supplement 5 of the National Building Code;
- iv) the Treasury Board direct the Department of Public Works to undertake a systematic review and correction of existing architectural barriers in buildings occupied by the federal government across Canada and that to this effect, 0.2% of standard objects 8 and 9 be set aside for such expenditures as the modification of the physical work environment, the adaptation of office equipment and the improvement of access and mobility;
- v) the Treasury Board set goals to remove existing architectural barriers in all buildings owned by the federal government within 10 years.



4) To remove attitudinal barriers,  
it is recommended that:

- i) the Treasury Board authorize and fund a publicity campaign directed at personnel officers, management and the general public to correct myths about handicapped workers;
- ii) the Office of Opportunities for the Mentally and Physically Handicapped (OOMPH) in the Public Service Commission undertake a campaign in consultation with the Advisory Board of handicapped workers to sensitize Commission Staffing Officers, departmental personnel officers and Manpower Counsellors to the special requirements of the recruitment and referral of handicapped people;
- iii) all departments be held responsible for raising the consciousness and sensitivity of management to the capabilities of handicapped workers;
- iv) the Department of Manpower and Immigration, because of its responsibility for placing workers in the open labour market in Canada, should also conduct a publicity campaign directed at the general public. Public servants as citizens will





also benefit from this exposure to a more positive approach to handicapped people;

v) the Advisory Board be asked to contribute and approve material produced for promotional purposes;

vi) the Anti-Discrimination Branch of the Public Service Commission establish a component to investigate allegations of discrimination on the grounds of disability.

5) To remove barriers associated with ancillary services, it is recommended that:

i) Treasury Board reimburse handicapped employees who cannot use conventional transportation for costs over \$1.00 per day (the handicapped employee to be responsible for finding the most economical means of transportation);

ii) for handicapped employees who cannot use conventional transportation and for whom no specialized transportation exists, Treasury Board direct all departments to work with the Department of Supply and Services to develop a special service such as that provided for non-handicapped employees outside the range of conventional public



transport, e.g., buses connecting Chalk River (Atomic Energy of Canada Limited) with Deep River (the residential area for this work site), those connecting Shirley's Bay with OC Transpo buses;

- iii) the Treasury Board ensure that departments make use of their existing authority to purchase supplies under \$150. This authority is intended to buy such items as cassettes and desk lamps which may be needed by handicapped employees as much as or instead of conventional items supplied to the non-handicapped employees without question;
- iv) equipment over \$150., where necessary, be cost-shared on a 50-50 basis by the Treasury Board, as the employer, and the handicapped employee, and that such aids immediately become the property of the individual, rather than of the government;
- v) a loan fund be established under the Treasury Board from which handicapped employees may borrow their share of equipment costs when no other government sources of financing are available, and that repayment be expedited by an initial interest-free period, long terms, low interest and forgivable periods;



- vi) the Treasury Board authorize additional man-years to provide part-time reading assistance for blind employees where considered essential, regardless of the rank of the blind employee.

C) Operational Recommendations for Mentally Handicapped People

Employment opportunities for mentally retarded workers, unlike those for people with physical handicaps, will always be limited to certain types of jobs. Furthermore, while those with mental limitations may be able to perform certain jobs very satisfactorily, they will rarely be selected in an open competition over applicants who are not mentally limited. Thus, the measures needed to increase employment for this group are quite different from those pertaining to the physically handicapped workers. Also, unlike the problems facing those with physical limitations, problems facing those with mental handicaps do require further study.

- 1) To increase employment opportunities in the Federal Public Service for those with mental limitations, it is recommended that:

- i) the Office of Opportunities for the Mentally and Physically Handicapped (OOMPH) in the Public Service Commission take measures to ensure that full use is made of exclusion order PC 1967-2283



which waives the provisions of Section 10 of the Public Service Employment Act for initial appointment of mentally retarded workers. This exclusion order relieves such applicants of the necessity of participating in a competitive process for their initial appointment;

- ii) the Office of Opportunities for the Mentally and Physically Handicapped (OOMPH) in the Public Service Commission examine the suitability of certain types of jobs for those with mental limitations and ensure that the job description and selection criteria for such jobs are realistic;
- iii) federal departments in which jobs suitable for mentally handicapped workers exist be directed by the Treasury Board to set goals for the placing of mentally handicapped people in such jobs;
- iv) the Office of Opportunities for the Mentally and Physically Handicapped in the Public Service Commission undertake studies to determine the viability of a quota system and other means of placing those with mental handicaps;





- v) a strong campaign be undertaken across Canada by the Department of Manpower and Immigration and in the National Capital Region by both Manpower and Immigration and the Public Service Commission (i.e., in all offices which have recruitment and referral authority for Operational or Administrative Support Category positions in which those with mental limitations are most likely to find suitable jobs). This campaign should be designed to convince federal departments of the employability and usefulness of those with limited mental capacity in many positions in these two categories;
- vi) the Treasury Board, as employer, direct the Department of Supply and Services to make use of sheltered workshops, where many mentally retarded people can find employment, to produce materials required by government offices on a contract basis whenever possible;
- vii) the Department of Manpower and Immigration include mentally retarded workers in its Affirmative Action program.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1) One in Eleven Handicapped Adults in America
  - A survey based on 1970 U.S. Census Data by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Washington, D.C.
- 2) Handicapped Persons Study
  - by T.J. Samuel, Research Projects Group, Strategic Planning and Research, Department of Manpower and Immigration, February 1975.
- 3) Job Barriers: A Reference Paper Delimiting the Problem
  - by Research Projects Group, Strategic Planning and Research, Department of Manpower and Immigration, October 1975.
- 4) Report on the Employability of the Handicapped
  - by the Health and Welfare Committee of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce in consultation with Health and Welfare Canada, September 1975.
- 5) Vision Canada - The Unmet Needs of Blind Canadians
  - by Cyril Greenland, School of Social Work, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, 1976.
- 6) Internal Preliminary Documents, Transport Canada
  - 1) Costing of Transportation Services for the Handicapped
  - 2) Urban Transportation - A Key to Mobility both the above prepared by A. Atkins Planning and Urban Applications Branch, Transport Canada, 1976.



- 7) Some Recommendations with Regards to the Employment of Handicapped Persons in the Federal Public Service  
- by R. Jones, R. Powell, S. Slack,  
Personnel Psychology Centre,  
Public Service Commission,  
October 1976.

This paper contains a 7 page bibliography of material used during the Joint PSC/M&I Study.

Note 1: References 2, 6 and 7 are not public documents.

Note 2: After the joint study was completed the following document became available from Transport Canada.

Transportation for the Handicapped:  
A framework for Research and Development, Vol I  
Report, prepared by Systems Approach Ltd, October 1976.



















3 1761 1151089 3